



# *Town of Brookline*

## *Massachusetts*

### PLANNING BOARD

Town Hall, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
333 Washington Street  
Brookline, MA 02445  
(617) 730-2130 Fax (617) 730-2442  
TTY (617) 730-2327

Mark J. Zarrillo, Chairman  
Linda K. Hamlin, Clerk  
Robert Cook  
Steven A. Heikin  
Steven R. Kanes  
Sergio Modigliani  
Jonathan Simpson

### **BROOKLINE PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES** **Room 111, First Floor, Brookline Town Hall** **January 23, 2014 – 7:30p.m.**

**Board Present:** Mark Zarrillo, Linda Hamlin, Robert Cook, Steven Kanes, and Steve Heikin

**Staff Present:** Timothy Richard and Polly Selkoe

Mark Zarrillo called the meeting to order at 7:30 pm.

### **BOARD OF APPEALS CASES**

**39 Welch Road** – construct an addition at the rear for 70 square feet of floor area requiring FAR relief and Design Review (1/30) Pct. 5

Timothy Richard described the proposal and required relief.

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board.

Linda Hamlin thought that the plans themselves were a little confusing, but did not have a problem with the overall proposal.

The Board agreed that the proposal was minimal and attractively designed.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval.***

Steve Kanes ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-0): the Planning Board recommends approval of the plans by John Cunningham, dated 10/16/13, subject to the following conditions:**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, elevations and site plan shall be submitted for review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to obtaining a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building

Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan, stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor, 2) building elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect, and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

**43 Glen Road** – construct a covered porch on the first floor and an addition in the rear requiring setback, FAR and Design Review (1/30) Pct. 5

This case was postponed.

**88 Browne Street**– convert existing three family to a four family dwelling by finishing the basement requiring setback, FAR and parking relief (1/30) Pct. 2

Timothy Richard described the proposal and required relief.

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board. Mr. Allen pointed out that there were other units converted for basement units in the neighborhood, so this would not be something unusual in the area.

Steve Heikin said that he would like to see elevations of all of the building and how the proposed stair would fit into the front yard of the property.

Mark Zarrillo did not think that the stair in the front would work. Furthermore, Mr. Zarrillo thought that the Board could access the basement unit through the existing front entrance. He thought that they needed a survey of the property and more information for the access and stair in the front. The Board agreed and thought that they needed elevations to see how the stair would work.

A member of the public thought that perhaps an interior access to the basement unit would be preferable to the exterior stair and entrance. He thought that this would be significantly less intrusive in the neighborhood.

The case was continued to a future date.

**10-12 Greenway Court** (revised) – convert structures from six residential units to eight units by adding two garden level/basement units (2/6) Pct. 8

Timothy Richard described the proposal and required relief.

Robert Allen, attorney, was present to discuss the case with the Board. Steve Sousa, architect, was present to go over the plans with the Board. Mr. Sousa discussed the changes that were made since the last meeting, and how they incorporated the changes requested by the Planning Board.

Robert Allen noted that if half of the parking spaces were waived, they could get rid of two of the triple tandem spaces to create a better design of the parking area, to make a total of 14 spaces and still meet half the required parking.

Mark Zarrillo asked about the counterbalancing amenity, and Robert Allen said that they would do some replanting in the courtyard and general maintenance of the property to make it look better.

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval.***

Robert Cook ***seconded*** the motion.

**Voted (5-0): Therefore, should the Board of Appeals find that the statutory requirements for a variance to minimum usable and landscaped open space are met, the Planning Board recommends the following conditions.**

1. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final site plan showing the parking spaces, final plans and elevations subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
2. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit a final landscape plan indicating all counterbalancing amenities subject to the review and approval of the Assistant Director of Regulatory Planning.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Building Commissioner for review and approval for conformance to the Board of Appeals decision: 1) a final site plan stamped and signed by a registered engineer or land surveyor; 2) final floor plans and building elevations stamped and signed by a registered architect; and 3) evidence that the Board of Appeals decision has been recorded at the Registry of Deeds.

## **MINUTES**

Mark Zarrillo ***motioned to recommend approval*** of the minutes from December 9, 2014.

Robert Cook ***seconded*** the motion.

Voted 5-0 to approve with the discussed changes.

**Meeting adjourned.**

## **Materials Reviewed During Meeting**

- Staff Reports
- Site Plans and Elevations